

Customer No. 24498
Internal Docket No. PF040026
Date of Office Action: 12/23/2010

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 10 2011

Remarks

Claims 5-12 are pending. Claims 1 - 4 have been cancelled. There are no amendments to the claims.

Claims 5 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,829,487 (hereinafter Eiden)

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner contends in paragraph 13 of the Office Action dated December 23, 2010, that the illustrated example relies on features that are not recited in the rejected claims. Applicants disagree.

The illustrated example is as follows:

For example, assume a home network has a gateway connected to a personal computer (PC). The PC is connected to the gateway through a wired connection. The PC does not have any wireless connection. A laptop is connected to the gateway through a wireless connection. A user selects the PC as the user chosen device to authorize new devices into the community. The laptop requests insertion into the community to the gateway. The PC asks the gateway if it has received any insertion requests. The gateway forwards the insertion request to the PC. A user at the PC authorizes the insertion request which is forwarded to the laptop through the gateway. Without the claimed invention, there would be no way for the PC to be aware of the laptop's insertion request.

Below is claim 5 annotated with the steps recited in the aforementioned example. As shown below, the features in the illustrated example above are indeed recited in rejected claim 5.

5. A method for inserting a new device (e.g., laptop) in a community of devices (e.g., gateway, PC) comprising:

Customer No. 24498
Internal Docket No. PF040026
Date of Office Action: 12/23/2010

selecting, by a user, a user chosen device (e.g., PC) from one of the community of devices (e.g., gateway, PC) for authorizing insertion of a new device (e.g., the laptop) into the community; **(A user selects the PC as the user chosen device to authorize new devices into the community.)**

storing, by each device of the community which receives an insertion request from a new device, **(This is an insertion request from a new device - The laptop requests insertion into the community to the gateway.)** the insertion request in a memory of said each device **(The PC stores the insertion request from the laptop in a memory);**

forwarding, by each device of the community which receives a request from the user chosen device **(This is the request from the user chosen device or PC - The PC asks the gateway if it has received any insertion requests.)**, the at least one stored insertion request to said user chosen device **(This is the gateway forwards the insertion request to the PC);** and

performing, by the user chosen device (e.g., the PC), at least one user action for authorizing the insertion of the new device into the community **(A user at the PC authorizes the insertion request which is forwarded to the laptop through the gateway.).**

The aforementioned annotated claim clearly shows how the illustrated example is recited in claim 5. However, these features are not recited in Eiden as explained below.

Referring to Figures 3A – 3D of Eiden and col. 7, line 21 – col. 8, line 58, there is shown an exemplary illustration of how the application process of Eiden operates. A, B, C, and D are members of a group in which E wishes to join. The group has decided that it takes a vote of at least 75% of the members for E to join. In Fig. 3a, E is within range of members A and C. E sends an apply message to A (reference line 307) and A votes not to accept E and sends his decision back to E (reference line 308). In the reply message back from A, E receives information on the other members of the group, including that E is within range of C. E then sends an apply message to C (reference line 309), C votes to accept E and sends back to E a response indicating C's acceptance of E (reference line 310). E now knows that he needs

Customer No. 24498
Internal Docket No. PF040026
Date of Office Action: 12/23/2010

acceptance from others in the group to reach the 75% threshold. (See col. 7, line 46 – col. 8, line 15).

In Fig. 3b, E is within range of members B and D and outside of the range of members A and C. E sends an apply message to B (reference line 312) and an apply message to D (reference line (reference line 314). B votes to accept E and responds back to E (reference line 313). D votes to accept E and responds back to E (reference line 315). E now knows that E has obtained 75% of the votes from the members and is now a member. (See col. 8, lines 16 – 31).

In Fig. 3c, E is within range of B and D. E informs B that he is a member of the community by sending a message to B that seeks information on the other members of the group (reference line 316). B sends the information to E (reference line 317). Additionally, E informs D that he is a member of the community by sending a message to D (reference line 318). (See col. 8, lines 32 – 51).

In Fig. 3d, E is within range of A and C. E informs A and C that he is a member of the community by sending a message to A (reference line 320) and a message to C (reference line 319).

The Examiner contends that the feature of *selecting, by a user, a user chosen device from one of the community of devices for authorizing insertion of a new device into the community and performing, by the user chosen device, at least one user action for authorizing the insertion of the new device into the community* is recited in Eiden. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As shown in Figs. 3a – 3d, each member in Eiden votes independently to accept or reject the applicant's request for membership. There is not a single user chosen device that is selected from the community of devices to authorize the insertion of a new device into the community rather it is all the members. As shown in Figs. 3a – 3d, each member in Eiden responds to the applicant with their acceptance or rejection of the applicant's request. There is not a single user chosen device that performs a user action to authorize the insertion of the new device into the community rather it is all the members. For this reason, there is no *selecting, by a user, a user*

Customer No. 24498
Internal Docket No. PF040026
Date of Office Action: 12/23/2010

chosen device from one of the community of devices for authorizing insertion of a new device into the community and performing, by the user chosen device, at least one user action for authorizing the insertion of the new device into the community recited in Eiden

The Examiner contends that the feature of *"forwarding, by each device of the community which receives a request from the user chosen device, the at least one stored insertion request to said user chosen device"* is recited in Eiden. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As shown in Figs. 3a – 3d, the applicant sends the apply message to each of the members of the community. Each member votes to deny or accept the applicant's membership and responds back directly to the applicant the outcome of their decision. However, the members interact directly with the applicant and do not interact with other members with regards to the application of new members. For this reason, there is no forwarding of messages from one member to another and the feature of *"forwarding, by each device of the community which receives a request from the user chosen device, the at least one stored insertion request to said user chosen device"* is not recited in Eiden.

Accordingly, claim 5 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Eiden. Claim 9 which recites the features of claim 5 in apparatus form and its dependent claims are also not anticipated by Eiden for the same reasons stated above. Applicants submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been traversed and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection to these claims.


Customer No. 24498
Internal Docket No. PF040026
Date of Office Action: 12/23/2010

Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Please charge any required additional fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Olivier Heen, et al.


By: Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing LLC
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 3/9/11